1-4 diopans

WL 6/3 0530532

1503687

Superfund Environmental Indicators Survey Human Exposure Under Control & Groundwater Migration Under Control

Step 1. Site Information			
Region:	10		
State:	WA		
EPA ID:	WADGE	0514541	
Site Name:	Colbert	Landfill	
Construction Complete:	⊠ Yes	□ No	
Step 2. Human Exposu	re Under Contr	ol .	HARIOTE SERVICE
current land and/or ground to prevent any unacceptable	dwater use conditi e human exposure	ons? "Under control" means the under current land- and ground	under control or below health-based levels for hat adequately protective controls are in place dwater- use conditions only. This water- use conditions nor ecological receptors
₩ Yes		□ No	☐ Insufficient Data
Step 3. Contaminated	Groundwater M	Aigration Under Control	
Does the site have contami	nated groundwate	er?	1 TO THE REAL PROPERTY.
☑ Yes		☐ No (Goto Step 4)	
Is the migration of contamination processes?	inated groundwate	er form the site being controlled	I through engineered remedies or natural
☑ Yes		□ No	☐ Insufficient Data
Step 4. Regional Conta	ct Information		
Completed by:		1 2	
	(signature)	New Shong	
	(print)	Neil E. Thom,	0500
	(title)	RPM	
	(phone)	202-553-7	177
	Date	5/27/03	
Supervisor:			
	(signature)	17 ANN WILL	IMSON
	(print)	aun Willia	ame
÷.	(title)	ELL Vint #4 14	in alse
	(phone)	206-553-27	39
	Date	5/29/03	
			USEPA SF

Superfund Human Exposure Under Control Worksheet

Definition: Are all identified human exposure pathways from contamination at the site under control or below health-based levels for current land and/or groundwater use conditions? "Under control" means that adequately protective controls are in place to prevent any unacceptable human exposure under current land- and groundwater- use conditions only. This environmental indicator does not consider potential future land- or groundwater- use conditions nor ecological receptors.

Region:

Г	Step 1. Based on the most current data for the site, has all available relevant/significant information on	
No	known contaminants to soil, surface water/sediments, and air at the NPL site been considered in this EI determination? Explain Rationale:	
	List Site Reference Document: 2nd Fire Year Review	
	Yes	
	Step 2. Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air media known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from known contaminants?	No
nsufficient Data	Explain Rationale: Transcrate conc above Rob Clean up	
3.5	List Site Reference Document: 2nd live year Please	
	Yes	
	Step 3. Are there complete pathways between "contamination" and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under the current (land- and ground water-use) conditions?	
Insufficient Data	Explain Rationale: No que controls and alt walks No current gus exprosure above MCLS	No
	List Site Reference Document: 2nd Five yr Nerra	
	Yes	
	Step 4. Are the potential exposures from Step 3 within acceptable limits under current (land and ground water use) conditions (e.g., within the cancer risk range or HI<=1)? Explain Rationale:	Yes
nsufficient Data		
	List Site Reference Document:	
	No	

Superfund Migration of Contaminated Ground Water Under Control Worksheet

Region: State:	WA	
EPA ID:		
Site Name	Collect	
1		
No	Step 1. Based on the most current data on the site, has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the ground water been considered in this EI determination? Explain Rationale:	
	List Site Reference Document:	
	√Yes	1
Insufficient	Step 2. Is ground water known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, or criteria) as a result of a release from the site? Explain Rationale:	No YES,
Data		Site Do
	List Site Reference Document:	Meet
L	▼ Yes	Definiti
	Step 3. Is the migration of contaminated ground water stabilized (such that contaminated ground water is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated ground water") as defined by the monitoring	
Insufficient	Explain Rationale: 44	No
Data	Egenter y wells monetoring	
	List Site Reference Document:	
. [∀ Yes	
	Step 4. Does "contaminated" ground water discharge into surface water bedies?	
Insufficient Data	Explain Rationale: frobable - not documented	No
Duiu	List Site Reference Document: RFS	
_	∀ Yes	
Insufficient	Step 5. Can the discharge of "contaminated" ground water into surface water be shown to be "currently acceptable" as defined (i.e, not cause unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or ecosystems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented)? Explain Rationale:	No
Data	List Site Reference Document: RMC -	
L	List Site Reference Document:	
	√Yes	
nsufficient Data	Step 6. Will ground water monitoring/measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological data as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated ground water has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area" of contaminated ground water? Explain Rationale:	No
	List Site Reference Document: Monthy Diva	
	Yes	